

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/647,065	BRAUKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satyendra K. Singh	1657	

All Participants:

(1) Satyendra K. Singh.

(2) Rose M. Thiessen (applicant's attorney on record).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 December 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

of the record


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In an effort to further the prosecution of the case, applicant's attorney Miss Rose M. Thiessen was called on 12/20/2006 by the examiner, and was proposed with an amendment to claim 1 (addition of the term "an open cell configuration having", as supported by the specification at page 27, 1st paragraph, lines 2-4, in particular) in order for the claims to be in proper allowable form. The proposed examiner's amendment to the claim 1 was agreed upon by the attorney of record.